

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. Telephone Interview

The Applicants would like to thank Examiner Dazenski for granting and conducting a telephone interview on May 11, 2010.

During the interview the features of the “two-dimensional matrix,” as recited in claim 1 and as described in Fig. 11, were discussed in detail. Specifically, the limitation “plurality of different information recording mediums capable of having multiple video recordings simultaneously recorded thereto,” as recited in claim 1, was discussed with the Examiner. Additionally, the Applicants explained that Gunji merely teaches a single recording destination and Miura merely teaches displaying past, present and future times, channels and programs.

In view of the above-mentioned discussion during the interview, the Examiner kindly agreed that Gunji and Miura fail to disclose or suggest the structure of the “two-dimensional matrix,” as recited in claim 1.

As a result, the Examiner indicated that the current prior art rejections would be overcome when the Applicants file a response summarizing the results of the interview. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the prior art rejections discussed below in detail.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Plourde, LaJoie, Gunji and Miura. Further, dependent claims 2-6, 9 and 13-

21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plourde, LaJoie, Gunji and Miura in view of various combinations of Beach, Young, Akamatsu, Hanai and Kobb (secondary references). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to independent claim 1 and claims 2-6, 9, 10 and 12-21 that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites an apparatus including a reception means for receiving, as information indicating preprogrammed recording settings, a date of distribution, a time of distribution, an identification of a distribution source of distributed information to be recorded, and an identification of an information recording medium for performing a preprogrammed recording of the distributed information. In addition, claim 1 recites displaying means for incorporating the received information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings into a two-dimensional matrix defined by the date of distribution, the time of distribution, and a plurality of different information recording mediums capable of having multiple video recordings simultaneously recorded thereto (the plurality of information recording mediums including the identified information recording medium). Finally, claim 1 recites that the two-dimensional matrix has a plurality of divided areas, each divided area having a respective date of distribution assigned thereto, such that each divided area of the plurality of divided areas represents the respective date of distribution assigned thereto, wherein a display screen indicating the two-dimensional matrix is displayed.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on the Gunji reference for teaching that the two-dimensional matrix is defined, in part, by a plurality of different information recording mediums capable of having multiple video recordings simultaneously recorded thereto, as recited in claim 1.

However, as agreed upon during the interview, Gunji merely teaches that a single recording destination for each video is displayed in the table 310 (see Fig. 2, and col. 8, lines 23-34).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Gunji teaches displaying a single recording destination for each video, but fails to disclose or suggest the displaying means for incorporating the received information indicating the preprogrammed recording settings into a two-dimensional matrix defined by the date of distribution, the time of distribution, and a plurality of different information recording mediums capable of having multiple video recordings simultaneously recorded thereto, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants note that the structure required by the claimed two-dimensional matrix (see for exemplary purposes only, the structure of the two-dimensional matrix illustrated in Fig. 11 of the present application) will allow a user to easily recognize, at a quick glance, which information recording medium is used for recording each program distribution, allowing the user to easily determine the state of and the future demands on each information recording medium.

For example, it is clear that the “different information recording mediums” (i.e., BD1-BD, BD1-HDD, DVD1-DVD, DVD1-HDD, EXT-S1, and EXT-S2) are identified as being capable of simultaneously recording a video, such that the “two-dimensional matrix” includes (i) the date of distribution (3), (ii) the time of distribution (6), and (iii) the plurality of information recording mediums (4, 5) capable of simultaneously recording the video.

On the other hand, the structure of the table disclosed by Gunji merely identifies a single recording destination for each video. As a result, Gunji does not provide the benefit of the structure required by claim 1, because the invention of Gunji does not allow the user to determine the state of and the future demands on each information recording medium, because

Gunji fails to disclose or suggest the two-dimensional matrix is defined by the date of distribution, the time of distribution, and the plurality of different information recording mediums capable of having multiple video recordings simultaneously recorded thereto, as required by claim 1.

Now turning to the Miura reference, the Applicants note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on the Miura reference for teaching that the two-dimensional matrix has a plurality of divided areas, such that each divided area of the plurality of divided areas represents the respective date of distribution assigned thereto, wherein a display screen indicating the two-dimensional matrix is displayed, as recited in claim 1.

However, as agreed upon during the interview, Miura merely teaches that a screen displays program (including past programs), so that a user can identify a time, a channel, and a program (see Fig. 7).

Thus, in view of the above and as agreed upon during the interview, it is evident that Miura merely teaches displaying a time, channel and a program of past, present and future programs, but fails to disclose or suggest that the two-dimensional matrix has a plurality of divided areas, each divided area having a respective date of distribution assigned thereto, such that each divided area of the plurality of divided areas represents the respective date of distribution assigned thereto, wherein a display screen indicating the two-dimensional matrix is displayed, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9, 10 and 12-21 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Plourde, LaJoie in view of Gunji and Miura or any of the other secondary references.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Plourde, LaJoie, Gunji and/or Miura or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Plourde, LaJoie, Gunji and/or Miura to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9, 10 and 12-21 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 2-6, 9, and 13-21, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plourde, LaJoie, Gunji and Miura in view of various combinations of Beach, Young, Akamatsu, Hanai and Kobb (secondary references), it is submitted that the secondary references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Plourde, LaJoie, Gunji and Miura references. Therefore, no obvious combination of Plourde, LaJoie, Gunji and Miura with any of the secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-6, 9, 10 and 12-21 that depend therefrom.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Hiroyuki KONDO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
By 2010.05.26 15:33:43 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
May 26, 2010